PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

	(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)	0/089162				
Applicant's or agent's file reference B13335.3 PA	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	International filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)				
PCT/FR00/02653	26 September 2000 (26.09.00)	27 September 1999 (27.09.99)				
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC B27K 7/00 RECEIVED 406 2 2002						
Applicant COMMISSARIAT A L'ENERGIE ATOMIQUE						
This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.						
2. This REPORT consists of a total of sheets, including this cover sheet.						
This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).						
These annexes consist of a total of 2 sheets.						
3. This report contains indications relation						
I Basis of the report		S S IN				
II Priority						
III Non-establishment of	These annexes consist of a total of2 sheets. 3. This report contains indications relating to the following items: I					
IV Lack of unity of inve	The trade of the office of the					
V Reasoned statement citations and explan	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement					
VI Certain documents cited						
VII Certain defects in th						
VIII Certain observations	ons on the international application					
Date of submission of the demand	Date of completion of	Date of completion of this report				
17 March 2001 (17.03.	01) 02 No	02 November 2001 (02.11.2001)				
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP	Authorized officer	Authorized officer				
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.	Telephone No.				

Translation

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/FR00/02653

I. Basis of the report							
		ets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation and are not annexed to the report since they do not contain amendments.):					
the international	application as originally filed.						
the description,	pages1-44	, as originally filed,					
	pages	, filed with the demand,					
	pages						
	pages	, filed with the letter of					
the claims,	Nos	, as originally filed,					
		, as amended under Article 19,					
	Nos	_ , filed with the demand,					
	Nos. 19-23	, filed with the letter of 11 October 2001 (11.10.2001) ,					
	Nos.	, filed with the letter of					
the drawings,	sheets/fig1/3-3/3	, as originally filed,					
	sheets/fig	, filed with the demand,					
	sheets/fig	, filed with the letter of,					
	sheets/fig	, filed with the letter of					
2. The amendments have result	ed in the cancellation of:						
the description,	pages						
the claims,	Nos						
the drawings,	sheets/fig						
		mendments had not been made, since they have been considered ne Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).					
io ge ouyene ine eiser							
4. Additional observations, if n	ecessary:	The second secon					
		AUG OF TOOS ED					
		C 7 700 0					
		•					

. INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No. PCT/FR 00/02653

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Sta	tement			
N	lovelty (N)	Claims	(1-21)	YES
	•	Claims	22-23	NO
ļ II	nventive step (IS)	Claims	1-21	YES
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Claims	22-23	NO
I	ndustrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-23	YES
		Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: CHEMICAL ABSTRACTS, vol. 91, no. 21, 19 November 1979, abstract no. 173344; GARCIA DEL RIO, J.R.

D2: WO-A-98 16288

2. D1 describes a method for decontaminating cork, including the steps of contacting the cork with a dense pressurised fluid (CO2) to which a co-solvent has been added (ethylene oxide). D1 therefore describes all the features of independent Claim 23.

Claim 23 does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(2), as it is not novel.

D2, in particular Figure 2 and the related part of the description, describes an installation as per independent Claim 22, including means in the form of autoclaves for contacting the material to be treated (1, 2), liquefier means (16), a pump (5), a supercritical exchanger (7), separators (11, 12, 13) for separating the treated material from the extracted compounds, and means (15) for recycling the fluid. Since reference to a method cannot serve

PCT/FR 00/02653

to distinguish a known installation, D2 describes all the features of Claim 22.

Therefore, Claim 22 does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(2), as it is not novel.

- As compared with D1, which is considered the closest 4. prior art document and describes a method for treating cork including the step of decontaminating the cork material with a mixture of carbon dioxide and ethylene oxide at a temperature of $55\,^{\circ}\text{C}$, the novel feature of Claim 1 is the specificpressure/temperature combination. By means of this novel feature, contaminants responsible for undesirable flavours can be selectively extracted from the cork material without affecting desirable compounds. None of the documents cited in the search report addresses this specific problem or suggests the solution thereto. The document CHEMICAL ABSTRACTS, vol. 126, no. 8, 24 February 1997, Columbus, Ohio, US; abstract no. 101255 teaches the use of higher pressures for extracting suberin. Claim 1 is therefore considered to be a non-obvious alternative and meets the requirements of PCT Article 33(2) and (3). The same reasoning applies to independent Claims 12 and 21, which refer back to Claim 1.
- 5. Industrial applicability is obvious (PCT Article 33(4)).